Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

Strengthening coherence between forestry and social protection for sustainable agrifood systems transformation

A diagnostic tool

SHOUT
SHARE
IT

Strengthening coherence between forestry and social protection for sustainable agrifood systems transformation
A diagnostic tool

Qiang Ma, Greta Campora and Davina Osei

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

Rome 2025

Required citation:

Ma, Q., Campora, G. & Osei, D. 2025. *Strengthening coherence between forestry and social protection for sustainable agrifood systems transformation – A diagnostic tool.* Rome, FAO. https://doi.org/10.4060/cd7631en

The designations employed and the presentation of material in this information product do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) concerning the legal or development status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries. Dashed lines on maps represent approximate border lines for which there may not yet be full agreement. The mention of specific companies or products of manufacturers, whether or not these have been patented, does not imply that these have been endorsed or recommended by FAO in preference to others of a similar nature that are not mentioned.

The views expressed in this information product are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of FAO.

ISBN 978-92-5-140304-4
© FAO, 2025

Some rights reserved. This work is made available under the Creative Commons Attribution- 4.0 International licence (CC BY 4.0: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/legalcode.en).

Under the terms of this licence, this work may be copied, redistributed and adapted, provided that the work is appropriately cited. In any use of this work, there should be no suggestion that FAO endorses any specific organization, products or services. The use of the FAO logo is not permitted. If a translation or adaptation of this work is created, it must include the following disclaimer along with the required citation: "This translation [or adaptation] was not created by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). FAO is not responsible for the content or accuracy of this translation [or adaptation]. The original [Language] edition shall be the authoritative edition."

Any dispute arising under this licence that cannot be settled amicably shall be referred to arbitration in accordance with the Arbitration Rules of the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law (UNCITRAL). The parties shall be bound by any arbitration award rendered as a result of such arbitration as the final adjudication of such a dispute.

Third-party materials. This Creative Commons licence CC BY 4.0 does not apply to non-FAO copyright materials included in this publication. Users wishing to reuse material from this work that is attributed to a third party, such as tables, figures or images, are responsible for determining whether permission is needed for that reuse and for obtaining permission from the copyright holder. The risk of claims resulting from infringement of any third-party-owned component in the work rests solely with the user.

FAO photographs. FAO photographs that may appear in this work are not subject to the above-mentioned Creative Commons licence. Queries for the use of any FAO photographs should be submitted to: photo-library@fao.org.

Sales, rights and licensing. FAO information products are available on the FAO website (www.fao.org/publications) and print copies can be purchased through the distributors listed there. For general enquiries about FAO publications please contact: publications@fao.org. Queries regarding rights and licensing of publications should be submitted to: copyright@fao.org.

Cover photograph: ©FAO/Qiang Ma

Contents

Acknowledgements v

Abbreviations vi

Introduction 1

Purpose and scope of the tool 2

Target audience 3

Navigating the tool 3

Preparing the tool 4

Part A. Methodology and process 5

1. Core areas of assessment 7

i. Socio-economic assessment of forest-dependent people and Indigenous Peoples 8

ii. Social protection and forestry policies and programmes 8

iii. An enabling environment for greater coherence 10

iv. Programme performance and the experience of beneficiaries 11

2. Methodological approach 13

i. The desk review 13

ii. Field-based data collection 14

iii. National and subnational multi-stakeholder validation workshops 16

3. Operational issues 19

i. Roadmap for data collection and analysis in the field 19

ii. Training agenda 20

iii. Fieldwork protocol 21

iv. Recording qualitative information 22

v. Analysing the collected data 23

vi. Recording and analysing quantitative data 23

Part B. Data collection instruments 25

I. Interview Guides 27

N1/D1. Key informant interviews for forestry authorities at the national and district levels 27

N2/D2: Key informant interviews for social protection authorities at the national and district levels 29

N3/D3 Key informant interviews for donors and/or NGOs engaged in forestry and social protection at the national and district levels 31

N4/D4 Key informant interviews for forest and farm producer organization leaders at the national and district levels 32

I. Focus Group Discussions 35

C1. Focus group discussion with programme beneficiaries at the community level 35

C2. Focus group discussion with forest producer organization members at the community level 38

C3. Focus group discussion guide for community or village leaders 41

II. Semi-structured Interviews 45

C4. Semi-structured interview guide for individual community members 45

III. Survey Questionnaire 49

H1. Socio-economic household survey questionnaire 49

Glossary 61

References 65

Boxes

1. Typology of interactions 9

2. Proposed key informant interviews at the national and district levels 15

3. Proposed focus group discussions and semi-structured interviews at the community level 17

Tables

1 Diagnostic methods and assessment information to be obtained 16

2 Levels of inquiry, respondent type and data collection types for forest-depended community assessments 26

Acknowledgements

This document was prepared with the help of the Forest and Farm Facility, which operates in 14 countries. Special thanks go to Nepal and Viet Nam, which supported testing the Diagnostic tool.

Thanks to Thomas Hofer, Team Leader of the Forestry and Livelihoods Team, and Ewald Rametsteiner, Deputy Director of the Forestry Division of FAO, for reviewing drafts and providing inputs for improvement.

The publication was edited by Luisa LaFleur, and layout was provided by Roberto Cenciarelli.

Abbreviations

FAO Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

ILO International Labour Organization

NGO non-governmental organization

SFM sustainable forest management

SDG Sustainable Development Goal

FGD Focus group discussion

Introduction

This document is a diagnostic tool to evaluate how well forestry and social protection policies align to improve outcomes for forest-dependent communities. It aims to identify strengths and areas for improvement.

Forests play a vital role in sustaining the livelihoods of millions of people worldwide, particularly those living in rural and forest-dependent communities. These communities rely on forests for food, fuel, income and shelter, making the sustainable management of forest resources crucial to their well-being and economic security. In this context, the integration of social protection policies with forestry management is essential to address vulnerabilities, enhance resilience and promote sustainable development.

"Strengthening coherence between forestry and social protection for sustainable agrifood systems transformation: A diagnostic tool" has been developed to evaluate and enhance the alignment between these two critical policy areas. The tool provides a structured approach for policymakers, practitioners and stakeholders to assess the effectiveness of current policies, identify gaps and formulate strategies to improve coordination and coherence. By focusing on the synergies between forestry and social protection policies, the diagnostic tool aims to foster inclusive growth, reduce poverty, and enhance the resilience of forest-dependent populations.

This diagnostic tool aligns with the Food and Agriculture Organization's (FAO) Framework for Analysis and Action for Forestry and Social Protection, which outlines a comprehensive strategy to integrate social protection measures with sustainable forest management practices. The framework emphasizes the need for a coordinated approach that considers the diverse needs of forest-dependent communities and the complex dynamics of forest ecosystems. It advocates for policies that support the rights and livelihoods of forest-dependent communities, that enhance access to resources and that promote the equitable sharing of forest benefits.

By using this diagnostic tool in conjunction with the FAO Framework for Analysis and Action, countries can systematically evaluate their policies and programmes, ensuring that they address the multidimensional aspects of poverty and vulnerability faced by forest-dependent communities. This approach not only enhances the effectiveness of social protection and forestry policies, but also contributes to achieving the broader Sustainable Development Goals, such as biodiversity conservation, climate change mitigation and poverty eradication.

In summary, the diagnostic tool serves as a practical analytical instrument to guide the implementation of integrated policy frameworks that leverage the strengths of both forestry and social protection policies. It is designed to build the capacity of stakeholders to create synergies, promote cross-sectoral collaboration and drive transformative change for communities that depend on forests for their livelihoods.

Purpose and scope of the tool

In strengthening coherence between forestry and social protection policies, this diagnostic tool will be used to assess the existing state of coherence and identify areas that require improvement.

The tool provides a methodology to enable users to:

- document and analyse the nature (and extent) of the poverty, vulnerability and marginalization of forest-dependent people and Indigenous Peoples within a country. This includes the challenges they may face, such as economic, environmental, geographic, health and lifecycle, institutional and political challenges, and an understanding of the coping strategies that forest-dependent people and Indigenous Peoples undertake when confronted with these challenges;
- identify and map the existing social protection and forestry policies and programmes within a country and determine the scope and nature of synergies between them. This includes an assessment of the barriers to access for forest-dependent and Indigenous Peoples to social protection and forestry policies and programmes (financial, geographic, institutional, legal, political and cultural barriers, including ethnic, linguistic and gender barriers); and
- identify key entry points for strengthening the coherence between social protection and forestry policies in order to reduce the poverty, vulnerability and marginalization of forest-dependent people and Indigenous Peoples while enhancing sustainable forest management and climate change adaptation and mitigation.

Target audience

This tool is designed for forest producer organizations, government officials, non-governmental organizations, policymakers and other stakeholders involved in forestry management and social protection.

The diagnostic tool is intended for all actors who play an active role in improving the welfare of forest-dependent people and Indigenous Peoples, the sustainability of forest resources and the mitigation of climate change effects, through the design and implementation of policies, programmes and advocacy activities. Actors include:

- government staff and policy officers involved in managing the design and implementation of social protection and forestry policies and programmes (for example, national and subnational social protection, forestry, environmental and sustainable forest management authorities; and executing agencies, managers and project coordinators);
- development partners implementing social protection, environmental, forestry and sustainable forest management programmes; and
- civil society organizations including research organizations, non-state service providers, forest producer organizations, community-based organizations, representatives of forest-dependent people and Indigenous Peoples engaged in advocating for and providing services to reduce poverty such as social protection, sustainable forest management and climate change adaptation and mitigation.

Navigating the tool

The diagnostic tool introduces a method for assessing and understanding the state of coherence between forestry and social protection policies within a given context. Specifically, the document is structured as follows:

Part A: Methodology and process

- **Section 1** describes the objectives and scope of the diagnostic process, including an overview of the four main areas of assessment, namely: (i) a socio-economic assessment of forest-dependent people and Indigenous Peoples; (ii) a description of social protection and forestry policies and programmes; (iii) an enabling environment for greater coherence; and (iv) the social protection and forestry programme's performance and the experience of beneficiaries.
- **Section 2** proposes the diagnostic process. It describes the process for collecting and analysing information through a desk review, field-based data collection and validation workshops.

- **Section 3** contains detailed guidance for implementing the methodology, such as a roadmap for data collection in the field, a training agenda for the national specialist or team that will collect data in the field, interview principles, and a guide for recording and analysing both quantitative and qualitative information and delivering a comprehensive country report with key recommendations.

Part B: Data collection instruments

- Three tables are proposed to facilitate the collection of information through the desk review**.**
- Interview guides include a series of questionnaires that can be used to collect qualitative information in the field, addressed to different types of respondents at the national, district and community levels, and organized around the four core areas of assessment.
- A survey questionnaire is to be used to collect quantitative information mainly aimed at households in forest-dependent communities.

Preparing the tool

The diagnostic tool was prepared and adapted based on:

- "Strengthening coherence between agriculture and social protection to combat poverty and hunger in Africa. Diagnostic Tool" (Gavrilovic *et al*., 2016)
- "Strengthening coherence between forestry and social protection for sustainable agrifood systems transformation – Framework for analysis and action" (FAO, 2023)
- "Qualitative research of the economic impacts of cash transfer programmes in sub-Saharan Africa. A research guide for the From Protection to Production project" (FAO and Oxford Policy Management, 2013)
- "Strategic Framework 2022–2031" (FAO, 2021)
- The Inter-Agency Social Protection Assessments' "Core Diagnostic Instrument" (Inter-Agency Social Protection Assessments, 2024)
- "Social Protection Framework. Promoting rural development for all" (FAO, 2017)
- A review of relevant diagnostic studies on social protection and forestry (Ssanyu, 2017; Xie, 2017; Lwanga-Ntale, 2018; Cheng *et al*., 2017; Tirivayi *et al*., 2018; Katila *et al.,* 2019)
- "National socioeconomic surveys in forestry" (FAO *et al*., 2016).

Supported by the Forest and Farm Facility, the draft tool was tested in Nepal and Viet Nam. The assessments were conducted in both countries and that information was also used to refine the tool.

Part A.

Methodology and process

1. Core areas of assessment

This section will briefly explain the key concepts of forest-dependent people, social protection, forestry policy and coherence. The four areas of assessment to be addressed by the diagnostic tool will also be introduced.

Forest-Dependent People: Although a universally accepted definition of forest-dependent people does not exist, forest-dependent people are characterized by their spatial relationship to forests and the type of benefits they derive from forests, as follows:

- People who live within forests and for whom forests are the main land use and source of livelihood: for example, herders in tropical dry forests, hunters, gatherers and farmers engaged in rotational fallowing in forests (Shepherd, 2012), and Indigenous Peoples who have lived in forests for generations.
- People who live near forests: these people use forests for key inputs such as fuelwood, medicine or timber, or rely on forests for their livestock and food. Communities that fall into this category typically rely on agriculture as their main livelihood (e.g. rural farmers and landless households). They may have access to or use rights for forest resources. They also include people whose main livelihood comes from labour supplied to forest-based commercial activities, for example, forest-based enterprise owners or workers (FAO, 2023).

Social Protection: Based on the FAO Social Protection Framework, social protection in this tool is defined as the "set of policies and programmes that address economic, environmental and social vulnerabilities to food insecurity and poverty by protecting and promoting livelihoods". This can be achieved through three main pillars: social assistance, social insurance and labour market protection (FAO, 2017).

Forestry Policy: Forestry policies are generally defined as "negotiated agreements between governments and other stakeholders on a shared vision for the national forests and trees" (FAO, 2012). They set objectives for the sustainable management and use of forests and tree-based systems, and outline strategies to achieve them. Some relevant examples of forestry policies include: community-based forestry, designation of protected areas, forest and landscape restoration, forest tenure reform, payment for environmental services and the Reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation in development countries (REDD+) framework (FAO, 2023).

Policy Coherence: According to the Framework for Analysis and Action, policy coherence is defined as "a systematic promotion of complementary and consistent policies and programmes across sectors, thereby creating synergies to combat poverty more effectively". For example, coherence could entail a public works programme on reforestation and afforestation, which will serve the dual purpose of landscape restoration as well as reducing poverty (Gavrilovic *et al.*, 2016).

The core areas of assessment that will be explored at the national, district and community levels within a given country are:

- socio-economic conditions of forest-dependent people and Indigenous Peoples;
- social protection and forestry policies and programmes;
- whether an enabling environment exists; and
- programme performance and the experience of the beneficiaries.

The following areas of assessment will describe the topics to be investigated using this tool.

i. Socio-economic assessment of forest-dependent people and Indigenous Peoples

This area of assessment will provide current information on the poverty, vulnerability and marginalization of forest-dependent people and Indigenous Peoples gathered first by a desk review and then verified or refuted by different actors at the national, district and community levels. This area of enquiry will support users in:

- identifying the scale and intensity of poverty of forest-dependent people and Indigenous Peoples and the contributions that forests and tree-based systems make to poverty alleviation and sustainable development within a country;
- analysing the main vulnerability and marginalization challenges faced by forest-dependent people and Indigenous Peoples (e.g. as economic, environmental, geographic, health and lifecycle, institutional and political challenges) within a country; and
- determining the main livelihood strategies (forestry and other sources of income) of forest-dependent people and Indigenous Peoples in case of shocks and barriers to increasing their income generation within a country.

ii. Social protection and forestry policies and programmes

This area of assessment will provide current information on the existing social protection and forestry policies and programmes, the typology of interactions (e.g. reinforcing or conflictual) and the scope and nature of their linkages (e.g. free-standing programmes, joint programmes or aligned programmes). In particular, this area of assessment will support users in:

- identifying and mapping existing social protection and forestry policies and programmes within a country. This includes national, donor and community-based social protection schemes and forestry policies and programmes;
- assessing if these policies and programmes cover forest-dependent people and Indigenous Peoples, including potential access barriers (financial, geographic, institutional, legal, political and cultural barriers, including ethnic, linguistic and gender barriers) and whether these fit their needs; and

- identifying potential links among social protection and forestry interventions (for example, sharing target groups, win-win outcomes, activities and implementation arrangements, among others).

Box 1 Typology of interactions

The ways in which linkages between social protection policies and programmes play out and can be combined are context-specific, but they can be generally characterized as follows:

- **Reinforcing:** This occurs when social protection and forestry policies and programmes contribute to a common goal with each serving its own function. For example, social protection or forestry policies and programmes can be designed or adapted to maximize coherence between their objectives, thus achieving win-win outcomes (e.g. climate change mitigation and adaptation, poverty alleviation and sustainable forest management). Likewise, social protection and forestry policies and programmes can be designed to provide incentives for sustainable forest management, rewarding the provision of forest ecosystem services, and building up resilience against shocks. Well-designed and adequate social protection schemes when timed to forestry conservation measures, such as the designation of protected areas and logging bans, among others, can compensate communities whose livelihoods are compromised by these restrictions, thus reinforcing and maximizing their results.
- **Conflictual:** This occurs when social protection and forestry policies and programmes have unexpected negative and conflicting results that undermine sustainable development. When only focused on conservation goals and ecology, and not timed with social protection compensation schemes (e.g. the designation of protected areas, logging bans and tenure reforms), these policies can restrict the use of land for agriculture, thus unfairly affecting the incomes of forest-dependent people and Indigenous Peoples, who cause far less deforestation than high-income households or forest industries. Similarly, forestry policies and programmes often require that applicants secure property and tenure rights, which is not the case for several vulnerable forest-dependent people or Indigenous Peoples (due to legal and other barriers, such as the lack of formal recognition of Indigenous Peoples or government neglect of traditional customary rights over the land). Likewise, forestry policies and programmes such as logging bans may generate unemployment among former timber workers, encouraging illegal logging to maximize profits, which in turn may result in climate change, CO_2 emissions, deforestation and a loss of biodiversity. Lastly, social protection in the form of monetary transfers can increase land conversion to agriculture or settlements and result in forest loss if not accompanied by conservation measures, incentives for climate-friendly behaviour, sustainable forest management and the transformation of polluting value chains (e.g. charcoal).

Design approaches:

- **Free-standing programmes.** Social protection or forestry policy and programmes can be designed or adapted to maximize coherence between their objectives, thus achieving win–win outcomes. For example, forest policies and programmes can be designed to reach poor and vulnerable forest-dependent people and Indigenous Peoples, thus incorporating social protection into their design. As in the case of *collective tenure rights* for local and Indigenous Peoples (e.g. *community-based forestry*, *participatory forest management* and community forest reserves linked to *customary tenure*, among others). Similarly,

social protection can be designed to complement the livelihoods of forest beneficiaries, for example by identifying and registering people living in and near forests and Indigenous communities, as well as allowing beneficiaries to collect cash transfers at mobile points, thus being consistent with their geographical remoteness. Further, productive and sustainable forest management components can be incorporated within social protection interventions to sustainably increase and diversify the impacts on livelihoods.

- **Joint programmes.** Forestry policies and programmes, and social protection policies can be combined into one programme so that targeted households participate in both. The most common forms are incentive payments given to forest-dependent people and Indigenous Peoples for sustainable forest management or climate-friendly behaviour, mostly in the form of payments for ecosystem services (PES), PES-like schemes, conditional cash transfers or cash-for-work programmes. These measures are designed, implemented and adapted to maximize coherence between poverty alleviation and sustainability outcomes.
- **Aligned programmes.** Forest policies and programmes and social protection policies can be coordinated and aligned either to reach the same groups of beneficiaries and locations or to reach different groups and locations. Well-designed and adequate social protection policies can provide timely compensation for communities whose livelihoods are compromised by forest conservation restrictions, such as protected areas or logging bans, among others. Compensation by conditional cash transfers and cash-for-work programmes are increasingly used by governments as multi-objective coordinated interventions to reimburse communities for potential gaps or shortcomings produced by forestry policies and programmes.

For more information on existing empirical evidence, please consult the Framework for Analysis and Action (FAO, 2023).

iii. An enabling environment for greater coherence

Policy coherence requires coordinated efforts across different government agencies that should be organized to allow easy cross-sectoral collaboration (FAO, 2016a, 2023). This area of assessment examines five major pathways to promote a conducive and favourable environment for stronger coherence between social protection and forestry policies, as follows (FAO, 2016a, 2016b, 2023):

- **Political will.** This component explores the extent of political will and the motivations and incentives (or the lack of them) to mobilize high-level backing for policy coherence. The political will to accommodate different and often conflicting views on how to strike a balance between environmental and socio-economic considerations is important for crafting a coherent agenda (FAO, 2016a). This includes the consideration that ministries from different government agencies have for Indigenous Peoples and poor and vulnerable forest-dependent people in terms of national economic growth and ecosystem services. It also implies the political support resulting from the adoption of enabling legal and policy frameworks essential to enhance collective tenure rights for Indigenous communities and local people and their forest governance (Bradley and Fortuna, 2021).

- **Policy arrangements.** This component explores the crucial need for a clear, unified vision to transform political commitment into tangible action. This involves establishing national sustainable development frameworks, policies and programmes. It also highlights the importance of inter-ministerial cooperation to ensure that sustainable development plans effectively link poverty alleviation with forest conservation. Furthermore, it addresses the need to extend social protection and social safety nets to communities residing in and around forest areas. This component will help to identify whether coherence is on the policy agenda and to consider existing and emerging policies or strategic processes and efforts to pursue coherence more systematically. For example, defining a joint vision for coherence, win-win outcomes and sectoral priorities, and designing a joint plan of action to coordinate interventions, among others.
- **Institutional capacities.** This component explores which coordinating mechanisms (e.g. coordination platforms or single registries) exist to promote coherence across national, subnational and community levels, the functions that they have and how they work. This component delves into the potential separation of key government agencies relating to agriculture, forestry and wildlife, and developmental issues within a country. It also examines how decentralization (in terms of policy and programme prioritization and planning, resource allocation and programme delivery) and participatory approaches reinforce the scope for coherence.
- **Financing arrangements.** This component investigates the presence of national and international forms of sustainable and equitable financing toward coherence between the two sectors.
- **Human capacities.** This component explores the technical and administrative capacity – existing and required – for supporting the development, coordination, monitoring and enforcement of coherent policies and programmes.

iv. Programme performance and the experience of beneficiaries

This area of assessment indicates the performance and beneficiaries' experiences with selected formal and informal social protection and forestry policies and programmes, and if they have been implemented coherently. As such, this area answers the following questions:

- What do single or joint programmes mean for beneficiary households?
- What are the likely impacts of these programmes, and how do people experience and view these impacts?
- How can coherence be strengthened to maximize positive outcomes for reducing the poverty, vulnerability and marginalization of forest-dependent people while promoting sustainable forest management and climate change adaptation and mitigation? How can the unintended effects of social protection and forestry policies and programmes working in silos be minimized and compensated for?

2. Methodological approach

The proposed method consists of collecting and analysing information through a desk review (Tables 4, 5 and 6 in Part B); field-based data collection (Questionnaires in Part B); and national and subnational multi-stakeholder validation workshops (adapted from FAO, 2016b). It is recommended that the assessment process be overseen and possibly conducted by a national specialist or team of specialists with experience in qualitative and quantitative methods and programme analysis. The national team should ideally be made up of a combination of multidisciplinary experts, led by an experienced leader with wider regional or global experience.

i. The desk review

The preparatory phase includes a literature/desk review to provide background on the sustainable development strategies within a country, with a focus on the role and contribution of forests to poverty alleviation. This includes identifying the degree of poverty, vulnerability and marginalization of forest-dependent people and Indigenous Peoples within a country, including their livelihood strategies. It also maps the key features of existing policies and programmes, and the linkages between them, through a review of national sustainable development plans, social protection and forestry policies and programme documents, programme implementation and operational manuals, project monitoring and progress reports, and, where available, existing evaluations. The following literature and data sources can be reviewed:

- national development plans (for example, national sustainable and equitable growth plans and strategies, national poverty and food security frameworks, among others);
- high-level policy statements and strategies on climate change mitigation and adaptation, forestry and social protection;
- programme documents, including budgets, designs, implementation plans and targeting guidelines;
- relevant assessments and evaluations of the identified policies and programmes;
- national studies on development issues, economic inclusion, poverty and social protection;
- forest inventories and national statistics reports; and
- other relevant studies.

It is recommended to select key national programmes for review that have poverty reduction objectives, as well as those dealing with sustainable forest management. Policies and programmes to be included in this preliminary review should first be identified and then mapped against one another, for example, in terms of locations, forest-dependent people, Indigenous Peoples and other target groups, and explicit reference to cross-

sectoral links. As a result, by mapping the key forestry and social protection policies and programmes in a country, it will be possible to understand and frame the overall national vision and policy objectives, how these interact (e.g. whether they are reinforcing or conflictual) and highlight any overlaps or gaps. The next step will be to review the relevant assessments of the identified policies and programmes to collect information regarding impacts on well-being and production, and any evidence of spillover effects or multipliers, as well as programme implementation lessons. The findings from this preliminary review will inform the subsequent field-based data collection activities.

ii. Field-based data collection

Field-based data collection should use the "cascading method," through which the analysis is informed by collecting information initially from the central government, then from regional, district, community and household levels, thus making it possible to capture a range of views and experiences from a diverse group of stakeholders and to observe the ways that policies and programmes play out at different levels (FAO, 2016b). Depending on the resources and time allocated to data collection and analysis, in addition to collecting data from national-level stakeholders (typically based in the country's capital), two to four different regions, districts and communities may also be selected. These other areas should be locations in which the selected forestry and social protection programmes are operating and that represent various ecological regions and rural livelihoods (e.g. farming, fishing, forestry or pastoralism). Within regions or districts, one or two communities should then be selected to participate in focus group discussions (FGDs) and household surveys. The strategy and the selected communities should be discussed and agreed upon with government, community leaders and relevant partners.

The questionnaires consist of a series of proposed open-ended (interview) and close-ended (survey) questions tailored to different types of respondents and organized around the four core areas of assessment for collecting field data. However, they are not prescribed as fixed instruments, but rather to guide information collection according to the country's context (see Part B). To conduct the field-based data collection, a mixed methods and participatory research approach is proposed that includes the following components:

- **Key informant interviews.** These are semi-structured interviews with individuals who have knowledge or expertise on topics that are relevant to the research study, such as those with government authorities and staff from development partners, or non-governmental organizations (NGOs) engaged in forestry, sustainable forest management and social protection. Key informant interviews often take place with just one respondent and should be conducted in person or via telephone. They should be conducted at the national (central) and subnational (district/regional) levels.

Box 2 Proposed key informant interviews at the national and district levels

National-level key informant interviews

- National forestry and sustainable forest management authorities, executing agencies, managers and project coordinators
- National social protection authorities, executing agencies, managers and project coordinators
- Development partners implementing social protection, forestry and sustainable forest management programmes
- Leaders of forest producer organizations at the national level

District level key informant interviews

- District or regional social protection, forestry and sustainable forest management authorities, executing agencies, managers and project coordinators
- District or regional social development partners implementing social protection, forestry and sustainable forest management policies, executing agencies, managers and project coordinators
- Leaders of forest producer organizations at district or regional levels

- **Focus group discussions.** A focus group typically consists of 6–12 people who engage in a facilitated discussion on specific topics. FGDs are extremely effective for exploring predetermined issues in depth with relevant groups of people and capturing broader information, thus expanding on the information provided during key informant interviews (FAO, 2016b). As such, focus group participants are drawn from categories of people or households who are of interest to the study design (e.g. beneficiary households, leaders of forest producer organizations and forest producer organization members). The purpose of discussing these issues with stratified groups is not to gather collective views or experiences, but to stimulate debate and to explore differences in attitudes and perceptions within and between these groups (FAO, 2016b). *If logistical or financial constraints are an issue, users have the option to conduct a single FGD that combines participants from various target groups proposed in this tool. This approach can still provide valuable insights while being more resource-efficient.*

- **Household surveys.** A socio-economic household survey is designed to gather comprehensive data on the living conditions and well-being of households. It typically includes questions on access to basic services, education, employment, health, housing and income. The aim is to understand the economic status, needs and social characteristics of the population. This information helps in the formulation of policies and programmes that target poverty reduction, social protection and sustainable

development. The survey can also identify vulnerable groups and assess the impact of existing economic, forestry and social protection policies. A representative sample at the community level is a preferred sampling approach. For forest-dependent people, the aim of a household survey is to determine the scale and intensity of poverty, vulnerability and marginalization, evaluating their major challenges and livelihood strategies (forestry and other sources of income) in case of shocks and barriers to increasing their income within specific communities. These questions aim to generate specific insights and quantitative evidence about the needs of community members, the nature of social programmes and how they are perceived and experienced by beneficiaries (for example, cash transfers and health insurance, among others).

iii. National and subnational multi-stakeholder validation workshops

It is advisable to host national and subnational multi-stakeholder validation workshops involving those interviewed through FGDs, key informant interviews and surveys. The objective is to corroborate and triangulate the findings and recommendations by bringing together a range of stakeholders (for example, national and subnational forestry, social protection and sustainable forest management authorities, among others), donors, leaders and member representatives of forest producer organizations, NGOs, United Nations agencies, and universities and research institutions. The validation workshop will assist in producing a vertical (i.e. across various levels of administration), horizontal (i.e. across various ministries and departments), coherent and shared proposal or plan of action, with measures to be taken by the different institutions. This joint agenda will be the result of a comprehensive participatory process.

Table 1 summarizes the various diagnostic elements that will be assessed using the tool.

Table 1 Diagnostic methods and assessment information to be obtained

Method	Diagnostic information to be obtained
Desk Review	• Map of existing policies and programmes
	• Identification of gaps and overlaps in policy objectives
	• Understanding of the socio-economic landscape of forest-dependent people
Key Informant Interviews	• Insights into policy implementation and challenges
	• Perspectives on policy coherence and effectiveness
	• Identification of barriers to access
Focus Group Discussions	• Community-level insights into programme impact
	• Understanding of local challenges and coping strategies
	• Gathering of feedback on programme design and implementation

Method	Diagnostic information to be obtained
Household Surveys	• Quantitative data on socio-economic status and programme reach
	• Assessment of programme benefits and accessibility
Validation Workshops	• Triangulation of findings
	• Building of consensus on recommendations

Box 3 Proposed focus group discussions and semi-structured interviews at the community level

- **Focus group discussions (FGDs) with beneficiary households of various programmes.** The aim of these discussions is to identify the scale and intensity of the poverty, vulnerability and marginalization of forest-dependent people and Indigenous Peoples, analysing their major challenges and livelihood strategies (forestry and other sources of income) in case of shocks and barriers to increasing their income within a selected community. Further, FGDs aim to generate specific insights and qualitative evidence about how the selected programmes are perceived and experienced by households in concrete terms, through their attitudes, behaviour, livelihood strategies and environmental and socio-economic outcomes. This approach will shed light on the programme's design and implementation with respect to coherence and can provide insight into possible recommendations.
- **FGDs with members of forest producer organizations.** The aim of these discussions is to determine the scale and intensity of the poverty, vulnerability and marginalization of forest-dependent people, evaluating the major challenges they face as well as their livelihood strategies (forestry and other sources of income) in case of shocks and barriers to increasing their income within a specific organization. These discussions aim to generate specific insights and qualitative evidence about the needs of forest producer organization members, the nature of community-based social protection programmes provided by forest producer organizations and how they are perceived and experienced by beneficiaries (e.g. pensions and health insurance, and revolving and pooled funds through monetary contributions from members, among others).
- **FGDs with community or village leaders.** These FGDs engage key community leaders, including development, political and traditional figures, to explore the socio-economic challenges and governance issues affecting forest-dependent people. These discussions aim to gather insights on the effectiveness of existing social protection and forestry programmes, as well as the role of leadership in resource management and community resilience. By understanding the perspectives of these leaders, FGDs seek to identify gaps in current policies and programmes, and propose strategies for improving community well-being and sustainable development.
- **Semi-structured interviews with individual community or village members.** These interviews are designed to capture the experiences and perspectives of individual community members, providing a grassroots view of how environmental changes, socio-economic conditions and social protection programmes impact their daily lives. The interviews focus on understanding how households engage with forest resources, access income opportunities and cope with challenges. Insights from these interviews will inform the development of policies and programmes that are more responsive to the needs of the broader community, ensuring that interventions are both effective and inclusive.

3. Operational issues

This section contains information on some key operational issues for collecting and analysing relevant information, as follows (FAO, 2016b):

- roadmap for data collection in the field;
- a training agenda for the national specialist or team that will collect data in the field;
- principles of interview guides;
- a guide for recording and analysing qualitative information; and
- a guide for recording and analysing quantitative information.

i. Roadmap for data collection and analysis in the field

This section describes the step-by-step details of the field-data collection phase. The duration of this process will depend on the sample size and the number of data assessment tools to employ. The following three steps are proposed (FAO, 2016b).

Step 1: Key informant interviews at the national level

The national specialist or team will start the key informant interviews with government officials at the national level. The preliminary interviews may be useful to obtain relevant data on the poverty, food security, vulnerability and marginalization of forest-dependent people and Indigenous Peoples; the contribution of forests to poverty alleviation and sustainable development; forest resources over time; forestry policies and programmes; and the social protection system and its coverage.

Step 2: Key informant interviews at the district level

The national specialist or team will introduce the assessment at the district level with development partners, district officials, members of programme sub-offices and officials involved in programme implementation. This approach will serve to conduct a few preliminary interviews before reaching the community. As such, these interviews may be useful for obtaining district-level data and up-to-date information on district programmes.

Step 3: Semi-structured interviews and focus group discussions at the community level

In each community, the first contact will be with the community or village leader. After explaining whom the team is working for and the purpose of the assessment, the team will request permission to conduct the assessment in the community. Once permission is granted, the team (via the advice given by the community or village leader) will select a group of forest-dependent people among the social protection and forestry programme

beneficiaries, and leaders and members of the community and forest producer organizations for FGDs. These FGDs will be conducted separately with women and men, whenever possible, and focus groups will be composed of 6 to 12 participants. With larger groups, it becomes difficult to ensure that all participants can contribute freely and meaningfully (FAO, 2016b). For the semi-structured interviews, a few select individuals from the community or village can be chosen, ensuring a good demographic and socio-economic balance.

Step 4: Socio-economic household survey

A similar community entry protocol to that used for the FGDs should also be used for the socio-economic household survey. The process begins with the team obtaining consent from the community or village leader and explaining the purpose and objectives of the survey. Once permission is granted, the team will randomly select households to ensure a representative sample. Where possible, a sampling frame should be used to design the sampling approach to effectively ensure representation across the population.

The survey will include questions on access to basic social protection and social services, education, employment, energy sources food and nutrition, income (forest and non-forest related), housing and livelihoods. Enumerators will conduct face-to-face interviews with household members, ensuring gender sensitivity by interviewing women and men separately when appropriate. Each household survey is expected to take approximately one hour. The collected data will help identify the socio-economic status, needs and challenges faced by forest-dependent communities, which will inform the development of integrated forestry and social protection policies. Data confidentiality and ethical standards will be strictly adhered to throughout the process (FAO *et al.*, 2016)

ii. Training agenda

This section proposes a training agenda for the team that will collect data in the field. The final training agenda should be adapted to individual country contexts, the scope of the analysis, and the experience and skills of the team (FAO, 2016b).

Introduction to the study's objectives and design

The national specialist or team will undergo a training workshop (inclusive of the pilot) to prepare for the fieldwork. The training should focus on the assessment objectives (for example, key concepts and definitions underpinning the study such as the concept of policy coherence, core areas of assessment and questions), the principles of qualitative data collection, the methodological approach, the roadmap and a simulation through pilot and debriefing. It is important that the team be familiar with the methodology and core questions for undertaking the diagnostic process.

Introduction to the methodology

The team will then be introduced to the various methods to be used for conducting the diagnostic process, such as the key informant interviews and the FGDs.

Introduction to the fieldwork roadmap

The team should be presented with a roadmap for conducting the fieldwork. This will outline the sequence of the entire data collection process (for example, key informant interviews, starting at the national level and then in some selected districts and communities or villages).

Piloting and adapting the methodology and questionnaires to the local context

A pilot provides the opportunity to practice and further fine-tune the methodology and questionnaires before data collection is conducted. It is suggested that the questions be adapted according to the local context.

iii. Fieldwork protocol

Key practical and ethical considerations in carrying out research through household surveys, key informant interviews and FGDs include the following (FAO, 2016b):

Be flexible: Despite the guiding principles, the questionnaires must be used flexibly and adapted to country contexts and national visions.

Be participatory: The instrument should be focused on a participatory approach through exploration, probing and listening, rather than directive-based questions.[1]

Be respectful: All ethical protocols for conducting fieldwork should be respected. For instance:

- Community members and research participants must not feel offended or demeaned by anything researchers ask, do or say, or by their behaviour in the community.
- The expectations of community members and research participants must not be raised by anything researchers do or say during the fieldwork.
- Participants should feel safe and protected.
- All vulnerable and sensitive groups should be included, including the elderly, Indigenous Peoples, the landless, women and young people, among others.
- Potential respondents must not feel under explicit or implicit pressure to participate.
- Participants' privacy must be protected by guaranteeing anonymity and confidentiality in record keeping and report writing.

[1] The directive interview is one in which the interviewer maintains complete control and walks participants through the discussion to uncover what the interviewer wants to know.

- Participants should understand what is happening at all times. Is appropriate communication being used (including community terminology, dialect, gestures and language, among others)? This aspect needs to be carefully planned.
- Adequate translation must be provided when the national language is not the same as that of the person or persons being interviewed, and especially when interviewing Indigenous Peoples.

In addition, it is crucial for the team to keep in mind specific considerations when collecting data from national and district stakeholders, community members and beneficiaries (FAO, 2016b):

- The team members should introduce themselves and carefully and clearly explain the objectives of the discussion. Participants should understand and feel comfortable with what is going to be discussed.
- Permission must be sought for the FGDs, household surveys, key informant interviews and semi-structured interviews to go ahead. In the case of the FGDs, permission should come from initial consultation with the local community and village leaders, and then informed consent.
- Respondents should be aware that the research team is independent, with no direct associations to the national government or community elites.
- Clear parameters for the research methods should be determined and communicated (for example, the time and the right to not participate or to withdraw at any time).
- FGDs and key informant interviews should be set up at times and in places that are convenient for respondents (for example, after work and near where the interviewed persons live or work).

iv. Recording qualitative information

This section offers some tips for users on how to record and analyse the data and document findings. All of the FGDs and key informant interviews should be documented by taking comprehensive notes and accurately recording the information shared by participants in the tables provided in Part B, and recording the discussions if appropriate and allowed. Outputs from the FGDs will include notes and recordings of the discussions (FAO, 2016b).

The research team should write down discussions among the participants as they speak, using the words they use and noting occasions when participants disagree or when one participant's opinion is particularly strong. Local translators should be called in when a language other than that spoken by the team is involved. This is particularly important when interviewing Indigenous Peoples who may have their own language. When possible, the notes should include any thoughts on why differences are emerging (often a reflection of the personal aspirations, experiences and worldviews of the different

participants). The notes should record the discussions taking place within the group and why the group came to an agreement, answer or decision. Direct quotes and examples should be recorded when they illustrate or clearly express an important point. The team should probe for examples where necessary (ibid.).

v. Analysing the collected data

Once the data have all been compiled, the research team can begin the analysis by **building the story from transcripts and field notes**. Ideally, the team that has conducted the interviews should also be responsible for transcribing and elaborating on the information gathered into the tables provided in Part B. The team should: (i) read through the tables, noting key themes, and divergences in opinions that emerge among the four areas of assessment at different levels; and (ii) use a system (either sticky notes or colour-coded themes) that can highlight relevant text and synergies. This approach will serve to analyse and identify lessons learned around the four main areas of assessment (ibid.). The following are some guidelines for analysing data:

- Look for and report general trends in information. However, where there are significant divergences from the generally held view, report them as such.
- Try to report the information as neutrally as possible, letting the data speak for itself and using as many specific examples and direct, relevant quotations as possible.
- Look for divergent trends and opinions between population groups (for example, male or female, regions, levels of administration, beneficiaries, and programme implementers, among others), and report on these where they are substantial.

vi. Recording and analysing quantitative data

This section offers guidance on how to record, analyse and document quantitative data effectively. During the socio-economic household survey, enumerators should use structured questionnaires to collect numerical data on various socio-economic indicators such as employment, education, health, housing, income and access to basic services. Each response should be recorded accurately in the data collection forms or electronic devices provided.

Data should be entered in a consistent format to facilitate analysis. It is essential to perform regular data quality checks to identify and correct any inconsistencies or errors. Enumerators should ensure that all responses are recorded precisely as provided by the respondents without any alterations. Additionally, any missing or incomplete responses should be noted for follow-up.

After data collection, the national specialist or team should use statistical software to analyse the data. This involves coding the responses, entering the data into a database, and performing descriptive and inferential statistical analyses to identify trends and

correlations. The findings should be documented clearly, with tables and charts used to illustrate key points. The analysis should also include an assessment of the reliability and validity of the data.

To ensure data integrity, all steps taken during the recording and analysis process should be documented thoroughly. This includes the methodology used for data collection, any issues encountered and how they were resolved. Proper documentation helps in maintaining the transparency and reproducibility of the results.

Part B.

Data collection instruments

This section presents a set of data collection instruments for fieldwork. It contains a series of questions for key informant interviews, FGDs and household surveys, tailored to different types of respondents at the national, district, community and household levels, and organized around the core areas of enquiry.

Table 2 Levels of inquiry, respondent type and data collection types for forest-depended community assessments

Level of inquiry	Type of respondent	Type of data collection instrument
National level (N)	N1: Forestry authorities	Key informant interviews (KIIs)
	N2: Social protection authorities	KIIs
	N3: Donors/non-governmental organizations working on forestry and social protection	KIIs
	N4: Forest and farm producer organization leaders	KIIs
District level (D)	D1: Forestry authorities	KIIs
	D2: Social protection authorities	KIIs
	D3: Donors/non-governmental organizations working on forestry and social protection	KIIs
	D4: Forest and farm producer organization leaders	KIIs
Community level (C)	C1: Programme beneficiaries (social protection/forestry)	Focus group discussions (FGDs)
	C2: Forest and farm producer organization members	FGDs
	C3: Community/village leaders	FGDs
	C4: Individual community members	Semi-structured interviews
Household level (H)	H: Household head and members	Household surveys

I. Interview Guides

Notes to interviewer: Please use this set of questions both at the national and district levels (N/D). When discussing policies and programmes, ask the interviewee to prioritize two or three main policies or programmes for the purpose of this study, and focus the questions on these. Before the start of the interview, the national specialist or team will clarify the concept of coherence, including reinforcing and conflictual factors and the three coherence approaches with examples.

N1/D1. Key informant interviews for forestry authorities at the national and district levels

i. Socio-economic assessment of forest-dependent people and Indigenous Peoples

1. How have forest resources changed over the last five to ten years in [name of country/district], due to: climate change (increased, decreased or no change in the extent of bare lands in the forest); incidences of forest fires; exploitation for charcoal; soil erosion; agricultural productivity; livestock populations accessing forests; and invasive plant or animal species, among others?
2. What are the main challenges faced by forest-dependent people and Indigenous Peoples in [name of country/district] (e.g. economic, environmental, health and lifecycle, geographic, political and institutional) in the last five to ten years? Are these challenges recurrent? If so, specify.

ii. Social protection and forestry policies and programmes

3. Can you provide a summary of the main forestry policies (name, duration, aims) in [name of country/district]?
4. Can you provide an overview of two or three main forestry programmes that support rural development, including sustainable forest management and climate change adaptation and mitigation in [name of country/district]?

Name	Duration	Type and objectives	Lead agency	Geographical area covered	Eligibility criteria	Targeting method	Incentive measures/ subsidies	Coverage of forest-dependent people and Indigenous communities

5. For each programme listed, are there any access barriers for forest-dependent people and Indigenous Peoples (legal, financial, institutional, geographic, political and cultural, including ethnic, linguistic and gender barriers)? What would you suggest to overcome these access barriers? Are there ongoing efforts and commitments to overcome them?
6. Have these policies and programmes been implemented through a participatory process that includes relevant stakeholders such as the Ministry of Social Protection/ Development/Labour? (This question seeks more information about the two or three identified programmes.) Have these policies and programmes been implemented through a participatory process that includes the representatives of forest-dependent people and Indigenous Peoples?
7. Do you think these forestry programmes are coherent with social protection interventions? If so, which approach is used?
   - free-standing interventions with win–win outcomes;
   - joint interventions (forestry and social protection interventions combined into one programme so that beneficiaries can participate in both);
   - aligned multiple programmes.
8. Are these links reinforcing or conflictual?

iii. Creating an enabling environment for greater coherence

9. Is there national support to address the needs and challenges of forest-dependent people and Indigenous Peoples and their forest environment in [name of country/ district]? If so, is this commitment embedded into an overarching policy framework? Are there any obstacles to achieving it?
10. What mechanisms or platforms at the national and subnational levels bring together actors from forestry and social protection for joint planning and implementation in [name of country/district]? Are development partners and donors part of this process? Are forest-dependent people and Indigenous Peoples part of this process? Are there attempts to establish an integrated policy planning process?
11. Is there a joint sustainable financing mechanism for social protection and forestry policies and programmes in [name of country/district]?
12. Are adequate personnel available to support the design and implementation of coherent policies and programmes in [name of country/district]? What do you think is the level of understanding and general view of staff toward coherence between forestry policies and social protection policies?
13. Are operational tools (e.g. unified targeting systems) available to support coherence in [name of country/district]? Were these tools used in the programmes mentioned above?

iv. Performance of the programme

14. How well is [name of programme] performing, especially in combining the well-being of forest-dependent people and Indigenous Peoples, sustainable forest management and climate change adaptation and mitigation? Is there any impact evaluation or assessment? How can stronger links and sectoral coordination be improved? (Repeat this question for the two or three identified programmes to gain more information.) What are the main achievements, experiences and lessons learned?

N2/D2: Key informant interviews for social protection authorities at the national and district levels

i. Socio-economic assessment of forest-dependent people and Indigenous Peoples

1. What have been the main challenges faced by forest-dependent people and Indigenous Peoples (e.g. economic, environmental, geographic, health and lifecycle, institutional and political) in [name of country/district] in the last five to ten years? Are these challenges recurrent? If so, specify.
2. What are the current livelihood strategies adopted by forest-dependent people and Indigenous Peoples in the face of these challenges in [name of country/district]?
3. Are rural people, including forest-dependent people and Indigenous Peoples, adequately covered by social protection schemes?

ii. Social protection and forestry policies and programmes

4. Is there an overarching strategy for social protection in [name of country/district] (e.g. a national social protection strategy or vision)? Which are the overall objectives (economic inclusion, poverty reduction, resilience building, and climate change adaptation and mitigation, among others)?
5. Can you provide an overview of the main social protection policies (name, duration and aims)?
6. Can you provide an overview of the main social protection programmes that aim to reduce the poverty, vulnerability and marginalization of forest-dependent people in [name of country/district]?

Name	Duration	Type and objectives	Lead agency	Geographical area covered	Eligibility criteria	Targeting method	Incentive measures/ subsidies	Coverage of forest-dependent people and Indigenous communities

7. For each programme listed, are there any access barriers for forest-dependent people and Indigenous Peoples (financial, geographic, institutional, legal and political and cultural, including ethnic, gender and linguistic barriers)? What would you suggest to overcome these access barriers? Are there ongoing efforts and commitments to overcome them?
8. Have these policies and programmes been implemented through a participatory process that includes relevant stakeholders such as the forestry agency? (This question seeks more information about the two or three main programmes that have been identified.)
9. For each programme listed, are they combining the well-being and livelihoods of forest-dependent people with environmental and climate considerations? Do you think the social protection interventions are coordinated or linked with forestry interventions? If so, which approach to coherence is used?
   - free-standing interventions with win–win outcomes;
   - joint interventions (forestry and social protection interventions combined into one programme so that beneficiaries can participate in both);
   - aligned multiple programmes.
10. Are these links reinforcing or conflictual?

iii. Creating an enabling environment for greater coherence

11. If national support exists for addressing the needs and challenges of forest-dependent people and Indigenous Peoples and their forest environment in [name of country/district]? If so, is this commitment embedded into an overarching policy framework? Are there any obstacles to achieve it?
12. What mechanisms or platforms at the national and subnational levels bring together actors from forestry and social protection for joint planning and implementation in [name of country/district]? Are development partners and donors part of this process? Are forest-dependent people and Indigenous Peoples part of this process? Are there attempts to establish an integrated policy planning process?
13. Is there a joint financing mechanism for forestry and social protection policies and programmes in [name of country/district]?
14. Are adequate personnel available to support the design and implementation of coherent policies and programmes in [name of country/district]? What do you think is the level of understanding and general view of staff toward coherence between forestry policies and social protection policies in [name of country/district]?
15. Are operational tools (for example, unified targeting systems) available to support coherence in [name of country/district]? Were these tools used for the programmes mentioned above?

iv. Programme performance and the experience of beneficiaries

16. How well is [name of programme] performing, especially in combining the well-being of forest-dependent people and Indigenous Peoples and sustainable forest management? How can stronger links and sectoral coordination be improved? Is there any impact evaluation/assessment? (To gain more information, repeat this question for the two or three identified programmes.) What are the main achievements, experiences and lessons?

N3/D3 Key informant interviews for donors and/or NGOs engaged in forestry and social protection at the national and district levels

i. Social protection and forestry policies and programmes

1. Can you provide an overview of the main donor-led or NGO programmes that aim to reduce the poverty, vulnerability and marginalization of forest-dependent people and Indigenoius Peoples while enhancing sustainable forest management and climate change adaptation and mitigation?

Name	Duration	Type and objectives	Lead agency	Geographical area covered	Eligibility criteria	Targeting method	Incentive measures/ subsidies	Coverage of forest-dependent people and Indigenous communities

2. For each programme listed, are there any access barriers for forest-dependent people and Indigenous Peoples (financial, geographic, institutional, legal, political and cultural, including ethnic, gender and linguistic barriers)? What would you suggest to overcome these access barriers? Are there ongoing efforts and commitments to overcome them?
3. Are the programmes combining environmental considerations coherent with the well-being and livelihoods of forest-dependent people and Indigenous Peoples? (Probe for the identified programmes.)
4. If so, which approach to coherence is used?
   - free-standing interventions with win–win outcomes;
   - joint interventions (forestry and social protection interventions combined into one programme so that beneficiaries can participate in both);
   - aligned multiple programmes.
5. Are these links reinforcing or conflictual?

ii. Creating an enabling environment for greater coherence

6. During the programme design stage of [name of programmes], what incentives were there (if any) for the relevant stakeholders to explicitly consider the issue of coherence with other potentially overlapping programmes from different sectors?
7. What institutional arrangements exist at the national level to foster collaboration and coordination across development partners in relation to forestry and social protection policies and programmes?
8. What do you perceive to be the main human capital capacity constraints facing the forestry and social protection sectors, and in achieving coherence more specifically?

iii. Programme performance and the experience of beneficiaries

9. How well is [name of programme] performing, especially in combining the well-being of forest-dependent people and Indigenous Peoples and sustainable forest management? How can stronger links and sectoral coordination be improved? Is there any impact evaluation or assessment? (Repeat this question for the identified programmes.) If so, what are the main achievements, experiences and lessons?

N4/D4 Key informant interviews for forest and farm producer organization leaders at the national and district levels

i. Socio-economic assessment of forest-dependent people and Indigenous Peoples

1. How do the forest and its products contribute to the livelihoods of your organization's members? Can you provide examples of how these resources serve as safety nets during crises, such as income loss or environmental shocks?
2. What significant changes have you observed in forest resources over the past five to ten years, and how have these changes affected the well-being of your members?
3. What are the key challenges your members face in accessing and using forest resources, and how do they differ among different groups within your organization?
4. What major shocks, such as climate events or economic disruptions, have impacted your members recently? How have these shocks affected different groups within your organization?
5. How do your members typically cope with these shocks and challenges? Could you share examples of effective coping strategies adopted by your organization?
6. What are the major activities and income sources of your organization?
7. What are the major services that your organization provides to your members?

ii. Social protection and forestry policies and programmes

8. How involved is your organization in national social protection programmes? What role does your organization play in ensuring that members access formal social protection benefits (for example, cash transfers, healthcare and insurance)?
9. In your experience, how effective are formal social protection programmes in supporting your members? What barriers do your members face in accessing these formal programmes?
10. How does your organization collaborate with national governments or institutions to improve access to formal social protection programmes for your members?
11. What informal support mechanisms (e.g. community savings, mutual aid and local relief funds) has your organization developed to help members during crises or times of need?
12. What challenges does your organization face in providing informal social protection, such as managing resources or addressing the needs of the most vulnerable members?
13. How sustainable are the informal social protection systems your organization offers? What steps are taken to ensure that these systems can continue to support members over the long term?
14. How does your organization support members in developing forestry value chains? What are the supporting measures? Are there any linkages with social protection measures?
15. What initiatives has your organization undertaken to promote forest landscape restoration and/or climate change mitigation and adaptation? How does this contribute to the well-being of both your members and the wider community? What are the supporting measures? Are there any linkages with social protection measures?
16. What kinds of training and awareness-raising activities does your organization provide to its members in forest value chain development, forest landscape restoration, climate change mitigation and adaptation, and access to social protection?

iii. Creating an enabling environment for greater coherence

17. What are the national and district policies and programmes on forestry and social protection that your organization is affected by?
18. What sources of funding does your organization have?
19. What kinds of support does your organization receive from the government?
20. Is your organization part of any networks or collaborations that influence national social protection or forestry policies? How effective has your participation in these networks been?
21. What are the major challenges that your organization faces in supporting national social protection and forestry programmes?
22. What are the major enabling factors granted to your organization to provide informal social protection?

iv. Programme performance and the experience of beneficiaries

23. How has your organization's role in providing formal and informal social protection programmes contributed to the well-being and resilience of your members? Can you share any success stories or lessons learned? What could be further improved?

I. Focus Group Discussions

Note to the interviewer: It is important that the focus groups are composed of the 'right' balance of participants, with regard to gender and age. Before the start of the FGDs, the team will clarify the concept of coherence with examples.

C1. Focus group discussion with programme beneficiaries at the community level

i. Socio-economic assessment of forest-dependent people and Indigenous Peoples

1. **Role of Forest and Forest Products**
    - **Discussion Prompt:**
        - Let's talk about how forests and forest products contribute to your community's livelihoods. How do you think they serve as a safety net during difficult times or help you accumulate assets?
    - **Encourage Sharing:**
        - Can anyone share a story or example of how these resources have been crucial for you or your family?
2. **Sources of Income**
    - **Discussion Prompt:**
        - What are the main sources of income in your community? Let's compare how forest-related activities like logging and charcoal production differ from other sources, such as farming or crafts.
    - **Explore Variability:**
        - How do these income sources vary between different groups, like men and women or younger and older residents?
3. **Changes in Forest Resources**
    - **Discussion Prompt:**
        - How have forest resources changed in the last five to ten years in your area? Think about the impacts of climate change, deforestation or other environmental factors.
    - **Stimulate Debate:**
        - Do you agree on these changes, or have some of you observed different trends?
4. **Challenges and Barriers**
    - **Discussion Prompt:**
        - What are the biggest challenges you face in using forest resources? Are there specific barriers that affect some groups more than others?
    - **Probe for Differences:**
        - How do opinions differ on the best ways to overcome these challenges?

5. **Major Livelihood Shocks**
    - **Discussion Prompt:**
        - What major shocks has your community faced, such as droughts or economic changes? How have these affected different parts of your community?
    - **Explore Impact:**
        - Do these shocks affect you all equally, or are some groups more vulnerable?
6. **Coping Strategies**
    - **Discussion Prompt:**
        - Who can share the strategies they use to cope with these challenges and shocks? Are there community or village-level approaches you rely on?
    - **Encourage Stories:**
        - Who can share an example of a coping strategy that worked well for them?
7. **Participation in Forest Producer Organizations**
    - **Discussion Prompt:**
        - For those of you who are part of a forest producer organization, what benefits have you experienced? How do these organizations support you in managing risks?
    - **Discuss Improvements:**
        - What could these organizations do better to meet your needs?

ii. Social protection and forestry policies and programmes

8. **Overview of Programmes**
    - **Discussion Prompt:**
        - What are the two main forestry and social protection programmes being implemented in this community or village? What are their main objectives and impacts?
    - **Facilitate Comparison:**
        - How do these programmes differ in their approach and coverage for various groups in your community?
9. **Access Barriers**
    - **Discussion Prompt:**
        - What barriers have you faced in accessing these programmes? How can you overcome issues related to cultural, financial or legal barriers?
    - **Suggest Solutions:**
        - What ongoing efforts exist to improve access, and how effective are they?

10. Programme Coherence

- **Discussion Prompt:**
  - Are these forestry and social protection programmes complementary to each other?
- **Explore Perceptions:**
  - Do you see these programmes as coherent, or are there different views?

iii. Creating an enabling environment for greater coherence

11. Recognition of Needs and Vulnerabilities

- **Discussion Prompt:**
  - Have your specific needs and vulnerabilities been recognized by the authorities in policy design? How has this affected you?
- **Probe for Experiences:**
  - Who can share examples of successful recognition and inclusion in these processes?

12. Network Participation

- **Discussion Prompt:**
  - Are any of you involved in networks that influence decision-making in social protection or forest management? How could these networks be strengthened?
- **Encourage Input:**
  - What improvements could make these networks more effective and inclusive?

iv. Programme performance and the experience of beneficiaries

13. Community Strengthening

- **Discussion Prompt:**
  - In what ways have these programmes strengthened your community, such as improving livelihoods, promoting sustainable management or improving your governance practices?
- **Invite Examples:**
  - Can anyone describe specific benefits or areas for improvement?

14. Household Situation Changes

- **Discussion Prompt:**
  - How have these programmes changed the situation for households in your community? Let's discuss each programme's impact separately.
- **Explore Dimensions:**
  - How have they contributed to sustainable forest management, economic inclusion, and resilience to shocks?

15. Coping with Challenges

- **Discussion Prompt:**
  - Have these programmes helped you to cope with the challenges mentioned earlier? How?
- **Solicit Success Stories:**
  - Who has seen positive changes due to these interventions?

16. Attitudes Toward Risk and Poverty

- **Discussion Prompt:**
  - How have your attitudes toward risk and poverty changed after participating in these programmes?
- **Encourage Reflection:**
  - What are the key lessons you have learned from these experiences?

C2. Focus group discussion with forest producer organization members at the community level

i. Socio-economic assessment of forest-dependent people and Indigenous Peoples

1. Sources of Income

- **Discussion Prompt:**
  - Let's discuss the main sources of income for your organization's members (forest or non-forest related: charcoal, crafts, donor support, employment, farming, firewood, fisheries, fodder, institutional cash transfers or grants, livestock sales, logging, seedlings, tree crops or remittances, among others). What roles do forest-related activities like charcoal or logging play compared to non-forest sources such as employment or farming?
- **Encourage Sharing:**
  - Are there any particular sources that have become more or less important recently?

2. Role of Forests and Forest Products

- **Discussion Prompt:**
  - How do forests and forest products support your livelihoods? In what ways do they act as a safety net during tough times or help you build assets?
- **Explore Personal Experiences:**
  - Can anyone share a personal story about how these resources have made a difference for them?

3. **Changes in Forest Resources**
    - **Discussion Prompt:**
        - What changes have you observed in forest resources over the past five to ten years? How have factors such as climate change or land use affected you?
    - **Facilitate Debate:**
        - Do you agree on these changes, or do some of you see things differently?
4. **Challenges Faced by Members**
    - **Discussion Prompt:**
        - What are some of the main challenges you face in accessing and using forest resources? Are there specific obstacles that impact some of you more than others?
    - **Probe for Solutions:**
        - What do you think could be done to overcome these challenges?
5. **Major Livelihood Shocks**
    - **Discussion Prompt:**
        - What major shocks have impacted your community, such as droughts or economic changes? How have these events affected you differently?
    - **Explore Impact:**
        - Are these shocks recurrent, and if so, how have they changed over time?
6. **Coping Strategies**
    - **Discussion Prompt:**
        - What strategies do you use to cope with the challenges and shocks that have been discussed? Are there community-level responses or social protection services provided by the organizations you rely on?
    - **Encourage Sharing of Successful Strategies:**
        - Who can share an example of a strategy that worked well for them?
7. **Participation in Decision-making Processes**
    - **Discussion Prompt:**
        - How involved are you in national social protection decision-making or participatory forest management processes?
    - **Discuss Enhancement:**
        - How could you enhance your participation in these processes to better advocate for your needs?

ii. Social protection and forestry policies and programmes

8. **National Interventions**
    - **Discussion Prompt:**
        - What social protection or forestry programmes are available in your community? What types of support do they offer?

- **Facilitate Comparison:**
  - How accessible are these programmes to you, and what barriers do you face in accessing them?

9. **Forest Producer Organization Interventions**
   - **Discussion Prompt:**
     - Are there any support mechanisms provided by your organization that help you mitigate shocks and promote sustainable forest management?
   - **Explore Effectiveness:**
     - How effective are these interventions, and what could be improved to ensure better access for everyone?
10. **Training and Awareness**
    - **Discussion Prompt:**
      - Have you participated in any training or awareness-raising activities on social protection, sustainable forest management, or climate change resilience conducted by your organization?
    - **Discuss Improvements:**
      - What more could be done to enhance these initiatives and ensure everyone is well-informed?

iii. Creating an enabling environment for greater coherence

11. **Recognition of Needs and Vulnerabilities**
    - **Discussion Prompt:**
      - How well are your specific needs and vulnerabilities recognized by authorities in policy design? What impact has this recognition had on you?
    - **Probe for Examples:**
      - Can anyone share instances where your needs were effectively addressed or overlooked?

iv. Programme performance and experience of beneficiaries

12. **Organizational Strengthening**
    - **Discussion Prompt:**
      - How have these programmes strengthened your organization in areas such as poverty reduction, sustainable management and vulnerability?
    - **Invite Reflections:**
      - What improvements can you suggest for these programmes to better serve you?

13. Changes in Household Situations

- **Discussion Prompt:**
  - How have these programmes changed the situation for households in your organization? Let's discuss the impacts of specific programmes.
- **Explore Contributions:**
  - How have these programmes contributed to sustainable forest management and economic inclusion?

14. Coping with Challenges

- **Discussion Prompt:**
  - Have these programmes helped you cope with the challenges that have been discussed? How have they done so?
- **Share Success Stories:**
  - Who can share a positive change resulting from these programmes?

15. Attitudes Toward Risk and Poverty

- **Discussion Prompt:**
  - How have your attitudes toward risk and poverty changed as a result of participating in these programmes?
- **Encourage Reflection:**
  - What are the key lessons you've learned from your experiences with these programmes?

C3. Focus group discussion guide for community or village leaders

i. Socio-economic assessment of forest-dependent people and Indigenous Peoples

1. **Community Livelihoods and Economic Activities**
   - **Discussion Prompt:**
     - Let's discuss the primary sources of income in this community/village. How have forest-related and non-forest-related activities contributed to livelihoods?
   - **Encourage Sharing:**
     - Can anyone share how these economic activities have changed over time? What are the key drivers of these changes?
2. **Role of Forest and Forest Products**
   - **Discussion Prompt:**
     - What role do forest and forest products play in supporting the livelihoods of people in this community/village? How critical are these resources during times of crisis?

- **Explore Different Perspectives:**
  - How do different groups within the community/village, such as women, youth and the elderly, depend on these resources?

3. **Challenges and Vulnerabilities**
   - **Discussion Prompt:**
     - What are the main challenges this community faces in accessing and utilizing forest resources? Are there specific groups that are more vulnerable to these challenges?
   - **Explore Solutions:**
     - What strategies have been effective in addressing these challenges, and where is there room for improvement?
4. **Impact of Climate Change and Environmental Changes**
   - **Discussion Prompt:**
     - How has climate change affected forest resources and livelihoods in your community/village? What are the most noticeable environmental changes in recent years?
   - **Facilitate Debate:**
     - Do all of you see these changes similarly, or are there different experiences and perceptions across the community?

ii. Governance and participation in decision-making

5. **Role of Community/Village Leaders in Governance**
   - **Discussion Prompt:**
     - As community leaders, what role do you play in the governance and management of forest resources? How do you engage with the community on these issues?
   - **Discuss Leadership Challenges:**
     - What challenges do you face in fulfilling your roles, and how do you overcome them?
6. **Participation in Policy and Programme Development**
   - **Discussion Prompt:**
     - To what extent are community members involved in the development of social protection and forestry policies? How do you ensure that their voices are heard?
   - **Explore Enhancement:**
     - What can be done to improve community participation in these processes?

iii. Social protection and forestry policies and programmes

7. **Awareness and Effectiveness of National Programmes**
    - **Discussion Prompt:**
        - What national social protection and forestry programmes are you aware of in the community? How effective have these programmes been in supporting the community?
    - **Facilitate Comparison:**
        - What barriers exist that prevent the community from fully benefiting from these programmes, and how might these be addressed?
8. **Community-based Interventions and Initiatives**
    - **Discussion Prompt:**
        - Are there any community or village-led social protection or forestry initiatives in place? How successful have they been in addressing the community's needs?
    - **Explore Strengths and Weaknesses:**
        - What strengths do these initiatives have, and where do they fall short?
9. **Training and Capacity Building**
    - **Discussion Prompt:**
        - Have there been any training or capacity-building programmes related to social protection or sustainable forest management in your community/village? How effective were they?
    - **Discuss Improvements:**
        - What additional training or support do you think is needed to strengthen the community's resilience?

iv. Creating an enabling environment for greater coherence

10. **Recognition of Community Needs by Authorities**
    - **Discussion Prompt:**
        - Do you feel that the specific needs and vulnerabilities of your community are adequately recognized by government authorities and other actors? Could you provide examples of where this recognition has been effective or lacking?
    - **Discuss Impact:**
        - What impact has this recognition (or lack thereof) had on the community's well-being?
11. **Collaboration and Networking**
    - **Discussion Prompt:**
        - Is your community/village part of any networks that influence decision-making at higher levels, such as national or district levels? How effective has your participation been?

- **Facilitate Discussion:**
  - What can be done to enhance your community or village's involvement and influence in these networks?

v. Programme performance and experience of beneficiaries

12. Impact of Programmes on Community Strengthening

- **Discussion Prompt:**
  - In what ways have the social protection and forestry programmes you mentioned earlier strengthened your community? Consider aspects such as poverty reduction, sustainable forest management and vulnerability.
- **Invite Reflections:**
  - What improvements can you suggest for these programmes to better serve the community?

13. Changes in Household and Community Dynamics

- **Discussion Prompt:**
  - How have these programmes changed the situation for households and the community as a whole? Let's discuss the impacts of specific programmes.
- **Explore Contributions:**
  - How have these programmes supported sustainable forest management and economic inclusion in the community?

14. Coping with Challenges and Shocks

- **Discussion Prompt:**
  - Have these programmes helped the community cope with challenges and shocks? How have they done so?
- **Share Success Stories:**
  - Who can share a positive change resulting from these programmes?

15. Attitudes Toward Risk and Poverty

- **Discussion Prompt:**
  - How have community attitudes toward risk and poverty changed as a result of participating in these programmes?
- **Encourage Reflection:**
  - What are the key lessons the community has learned from its experiences with these programmes?

II. Semi-structured Interviews

C4. Semi-structured interview guide for individual community members

Participant Background:

- Could you please tell me a little about yourself (for example, age, family composition and occupation)?
- How long have you lived in this community?

i. Socio-economic assessment

1. **Sources of Income:**
   - What are the main sources of income for your household?
   - Have these sources changed over time? If so, how?
2. **Role of Forest and Forest Products:**
   - Do you or your family rely on forest and forest products for your livelihood? If so, in what ways (for example, food, fuel or income)?
   - How important are these products in helping your household during difficult times, such as during a bad harvest or economic downturn?
3. **Livelihood Challenges:**
   - What are the main challenges your household faces in making a living?
   - Are there specific times of the year or certain events that make these challenges more difficult?
4. **Impact of Environmental Changes:**
   - Have you observed any changes in the environment, such as changes in forest cover, availability of water, droughts or weather patterns? How have these changes affected your daily life?
   - What do you think are the main causes of these changes?
5. **Coping Strategies:**
   - When your household faces difficulties, such as a lack of income or food, what do you do to cope?
   - Have you received any help or support from within the community/village, or from the government during these times?
6. **Membership in Organizations:**
   - Are you a member of any labour, social or other type of organization (for example, cooperatives, community groups or unions)?
   - If so, how has being a member of such an organization been helpful to you or your household? In what ways does it support you in dealing with challenges related to income, social protection or accessing resources?

ii. Social protection and forestry policies and programmes

7. **Awareness of Programmes:**
    - Are you aware of any social protection or forestry programmes available in your community (e.g. cash transfers, food aid, beekeeping and tree planting)?
    - How did you first hear about these programmes?
8. **Participation in Programmes:**
    - Have you or anyone in your household participated in any of these programmes? If so, which ones?
    - What has your experience with these programmes been? Were they helpful?
9. **Barriers to Access:**
    - Have you ever faced any difficulties in accessing these programmes? What kinds of barriers have you encountered (for example, cost, distance or eligibility)?
    - What do you think could be done to make these programmes more accessible to people like you?

iii. Community engagement and governance

10. **Involvement in Community Decision-Making:**
    - How involved are you in decisions that affect the community, such as those related to the use of forest resources or social protection programmes?
    - Do you feel your voice is heard in these decisions? If not, what do you think could help improve this?
11. **Role of Community Leaders:**
    - How do you view the role of community leaders (development, political and traditional leaders) in managing community affairs, particularly in relation to forest resources and social protection?
    - Are there ways you think they could improve their support for the community?

iv. Perceptions of risk and resilience

12. **Experiences with Shocks:**
    - Has your household experienced any significant shocks in recent years, such as droughts, floods or loss of income? How did you manage during these times?
    - Do you think the community as a whole is resilient to these kinds of shocks? Why or why not?
13. **Attitudes toward the Future:**
    - How do you feel about the future of your household and community? Are you optimistic or worried about certain issues? Why?
    - What changes would you like to see to help improve life in the community?

v. Final thoughts and suggestions

14. Community Improvements:

- If you could change one thing about how your community is managed or supported, what would it be?
- What kind of support or programmes do you think would make the biggest difference in your life and the lives of others in your community?

15. Additional Comments:

- Is there anything else you would like to add that we haven't covered in this interview?

III. Survey Questionnaire

H1. Socio-economic household survey questionnaire

Section A: Household demographics

1. **Household Composition**
    - How many people live in your household?

        ☐ 1–2
        ☐ 3–4
        ☐ 5–6
        ☐ 7 or more

2. **Gender of Household Head**
    - What is the gender of the head of your household?

        ☐ Male
        ☐ Female
        ☐ Other

3. **Age of Household Head**
    - What is the age of the head of your household?

        ☐ Under 18
        ☐ 18–24
        ☐ 25–34
        ☐ 35–44
        ☐ 45–54
        ☐ 55–64
        ☐ 65 and over

4. **Education Level of Household Head**
    - What is the highest level of education completed by the head of your household?

        ☐ No formal education
        ☐ Primary education
        ☐ Secondary education
        ☐ Vocational training
        ☐ Higher education

5. **Ethnicity**
    - What is the ethnicity of the head of the household or the household reference person?
        - [List relevant options based on region]

_____

_____

_____

6. **Marital status**
    - What is the marital status of the head of household?

☐ Single
☐ Married
☐ Divorced
☐ Widow/Widower

Note: Above questions 2–6 should also be asked for all members of the household.

Section B: Socio-economic and vulnerability assessment

Financial Capital

7. **Primary Source of Income**
    - What is the primary source of income for your household?

☐ Forestry-related activities
☐ Agriculture
☐ Livestock
☐ Small business/trading
☐ Formal employment
☐ Informal employment
☐ Remittances
☐ Other (please specify)

8. **Secondary Sources of Income**
    - What are the secondary sources of income for your household? (Select all that apply)

☐ Forestry-related activities
☐ Agriculture
☐ Livestock
☐ Small business/trading

- ☐ Formal employment
- ☐ Informal employment
- ☐ Remittances
- ☐ Other (please specify)

No.	Source	Income per year (currency)
1		
2		
3		
4		
…		

9. Income Stability

- How stable is your household's income throughout the year?

  - ☐ Very stable
  - ☐ Somewhat stable
  - ☐ Unstable
  - ☐ Very unstable

Physical Capital

10. Which of the items below do you own? (multiple responses)
    1) Radio 2) Television 3) Bicycle 4) Motorcycle 5) Motor vehicle 6) Mobile Phone
    7) Farm Machinery 8) Others (Specify) _____

11. a. Do you own any animals? Yes or No
    b. If so, please indicate the numbers using the table below. (Discussion is necessary.)

Livestock Item	Number
Goats	
Sheep	
Pigs	
Poultry	
Rabbits	
Cows	
Donkeys	
Others (specify)	

Natural Capital

12. a. How much land do you own/have in hectares?

0 - 1 ( ) >1 - 2 ( ) >2 - 5 ( ) > 5 - 10 ( ) > 10 ( )

b. How far is it to the forest in km?

0 - 2 ( ) >2 - 5 ( ) > 5 - 10 ( ) > 10 ( )

13. Which of the following resources do you access from the forest?

Item	Adequate	Inadequate	Not Used/Accessible
Building poles			
Timber from forest			
Grass for thatching			
Bamboo			
Sand			
Clay			
Stones			
Medicinal plants			
Firewood			
Gum and/or resins			
Honey			
Water			
Forest soil			
Forest fruits			
Fodder			
Other (specify)			

Social Capital

This section asks the respondent about groups or organizations, networks or associations to which they belong .

14. Participation in Forest Producer Organizations

- Is anyone in your household a member of a forest producer organization?

  ☐ Yes
  ☐ No

15. Benefits from Forest Producer Organizations

- If so, what benefits have you received from this membership? (Select all that apply)

  - ☐ Access to credit
  - ☐ Access to markets
  - ☐ Forest product processing
  - ☐ Training on forest management
  - ☐ Social protection benefits
  - ☐ Other (specify)

16. In addition to being a member of a forest producer organization, do you belong to any of the following organizations or associations?

Group	Tick if a Member
1. Farmers' group	
2. Traders and business association	
3. Credit/finance group (table banking)	
4. Tree nursery association	
5. Charcoal group	
6. Water group	
7. Youth social group	
8. Women's group	
9. Family group	
10. Cultural group	
11. Religious organization	
12. Other groups	
Total group membership	

17. How much money on average in a year do you contribute to your groups or associations? (in relevant currency) _____

18. Please describe the benefits of joining the above groups or associations.

No.	Type of benefit	Tick if applicable
1.	Financial (marketing and credit)	
2.	Learning	
3.	Networking	
4.	Spiritual	
5.	Social Interaction	
6.	Entertainment	
7.	Cultural identity	
8.	Environmental improvement	
9.	Emergency relief	

19. Forest and Forest Product Utilization

- How important are forests and forest products to your household's livelihood (for example, consumption, safety net or asset accumulation)?

  - ☐ Very important
  - ☐ Somewhat important
  - ☐ Not important

20. Livelihood Shocks

- Has your household experienced any major shocks in the past five years (e.g. droughts, floods or food scarcity)?

  - ☐ Yes
  - ☐ No

21. Frequency of Shocks

- How often do these shocks occur?

  - ☐ Rarely
  - ☐ Occasionally
  - ☐ Frequently

22. Impact of Shocks

- How significantly do these shocks affect your household's livelihood?

  - ☐ Very significant
  - ☐ Somewhat significant
  - ☐ Not significant

23. Coping Mechanisms

- What strategies does your household use to cope with these shocks? (Select all that apply.)

  - ☐ Selling assets
  - ☐ Reducing consumption
  - ☐ Seeking additional work
  - ☐ Borrowing money
  - ☐ Receiving aid
  - ☐ Other (please specify)

24. Access to Credit

- Does your household have access to credit or financial services?

  - ☐ Yes
  - ☐ No

Section C: Access to social services

25. Access to Healthcare

a. Have you or anyone in your household needed healthcare services in the past 12 months?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

b. How far is the nearest healthcare facility from your home?

- ☐ Less than 1 km
- ☐ 1–5 km
- ☐ More than 5 km

c. How would you rate the quality of healthcare services available to your household?

- ☐ Excellent
- ☐ Good
- ☐ Fair
- ☐ Poor

d. What are the main barriers to accessing healthcare services? (Select all that apply)

- ☐ Distance
- ☐ Cost
- ☐ Lack of transportation
- ☐ Poor facility services
- ☐ Cultural factors
- ☐ Other (please specify): _____

26. Access to Education

e. How many children (under 18) in your household currently attend school?

- ☐ None
- ☐ 1
- ☐ 2 or more

f. What level of education is accessible within your district or community?

- ☐ Primary
- ☐ Secondary
- ☐ Vocational training
- ☐ Other (please specify): _____
- ☐ No schools available

g. What challenges do you face in sending your children to school? (Select all that apply)

- ☐ School fees
- ☐ Distance to school
- ☐ Poor quality of education
- ☐ Children needed for household labour
- ☐ Lack of supplies (books, uniforms, etc.)
- ☐ Other (please specify): _____

27. Access to Basic Infrastructure

a. Does your household have access to clean drinking water?

- ☐ Yes, regularly
- ☐ Yes, but irregularly
- ☐ No

b. Does your household have access to electricity?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

c. What is the primary source of cooking fuel in your household?

- ☐ Firewood
- ☐ Charcoal
- ☐ Gas
- ☐ Electricity
- ☐ Other (please specify): _____

d. What infrastructure services do you think are most needed in your community? (Select all that apply)

- ☐ Roads
- ☐ Healthcare centres
- ☐ Schools
- ☐ Water supply
- ☐ Sanitation
- ☐ Other (please specify): _____

Section D: Social protection policies and programmes

28. Awareness of Social Protection Programmes

- Are you aware of any social protection programmes in your community?

  - ☐ Yes
  - ☐ No

29. Participation in Programmes

- Has your household participated in any social protection programmes?

  - ☐ Yes
  - ☐ No

30. Types of Programmes

- What types of programmes have you participated in? (Select all that apply)

  - ☐ Cash transfers
  - ☐ Food aid
  - ☐ Public works programmes
  - ☐ Training programmes
  - ☐ Health insurance
  - ☐ Other (please specify)

31. Programme Access Barriers

- What barriers, if any, prevent your household from accessing these programmes? (Select all that apply)

  - ☐ Legal barriers
  - ☐ Financial barriers
  - ☐ Geographic barriers
  - ☐ Cultural barriers
  - ☐ None

32. Programme Effectiveness

- How effective are these programmes in improving your household's well-being?

  - ☐ Very effective
  - ☐ Somewhat effective
  - ☐ Not effective

33. Link to Sustainable Forest Management

- Do these programmes promote sustainable forest management?

  - ☐ Yes
  - ☐ No
  - ☐ Not sure

34. Link to sustainable livelihoods

- Do these programmes provide you with sustainable livelihood options?

  - ☐ Yes
  - ☐ No
  - ☐ Not sure

Section E: Forestry policies and programmes

35. Awareness of Forestry Programmes

- Are you aware of any forestry programmes in your community?

  - ☐ Yes
  - ☐ No

36. Participation in Programmes

- Has your household participated in any forestry programmes?

  - ☐ Yes
  - ☐ No

37. Types of Programmes

- What types of supports or benefits have you received from participating? (Select all that apply)

  - ☐ Cash subsidies
  - ☐ Food subsidies
  - ☐ Payment for environmental services
  - ☐ Forestry management training
  - ☐ Forest enterprise development
  - ☐ Other (please specify)

38. Programme Access Barriers

- What barriers, if any, prevent your household from accessing these programmes? (Select all that apply)

  - ☐ Legal barriers
  - ☐ Financial barriers
  - ☐ Geographic barriers
  - ☐ Cultural barriers
  - ☐ None

39. Programme Effectiveness

- How effective are these programmes in improving the health of your forests?

  - ☐ Very effective
  - ☐ Somewhat effective
  - ☐ Not effective

40. Link to well-being

- Do these programmes improve your well-being and livelihoods?

  - ☐ Yes
  - ☐ No
  - ☐ Not sure

41. Link to sustainable livelihoods

- Do these programmes provide you with sustainable livelihood options?

  - ☐ Yes
  - ☐ No
  - ☐ Not sure

Section F: Programme performance and the experience of beneficiaries

42. Changes in Household Situation

- How has your household's situation changed since participating in these programmes (for example, poverty reduction or livelihood improvement)

  - ☐ Improved significantly
  - ☐ Improved somewhat
  - ☐ No change
  - ☐ Worsened

43. Contribution to Risk Management

- How have these programmes contributed to your household's ability to manage risks?

  - ☐ Very positively
  - ☐ Positively
  - ☐ Not at all

44. Attitudes Toward Risk and Poverty

- How have your attitudes toward risk and poverty changed due to participation in these programmes?

  - ☐ More optimistic
  - ☐ Neutral
  - ☐ More pessimistic

45. Recommendations for Improvement

- What recommendations would you make to improve these programmes? (Open-ended)

Glossary

Agri-food systems. The agri-food system covers the journey of food from farm to table, including when it is grown, fished, harvested, processed, packaged, transported, distributed, traded, bought, prepared, eaten and disposed of. It also encompasses non-food products that also constitute livelihoods and all of the people as well as the activities, investments and choices that play a part in bringing these food and agricultural products to end users.

Biodiversity. Biodiversity refers to "the diversity among living organisms, which is essential to ecosystem functions and services delivery" (FAO, 2022).

Climate change adaptation. Adaptation to climate change refers to the process of adjustment to the actual or expected climate and its effects.

Climate change mitigation. Climate change mitigation aims to stabilize the greenhouse gas concentrations in the atmosphere at a level that would prevent dangerous anthropogenic interference with the climate system.

Coherence. Coherence is "a systematic promotion of complementary and consistent policies and programmes across sectors, thereby creating synergies to combat poverty more effectively" (FAO, 2016a). Policy coherence is conceived as a means and a process to reach sustainable development and it is a core aspect of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (Target 17.E Enhance policy coherence for sustainable development). FAO acknowledges that harnessing policy coherence across sectoral environmental and socio-economic domains is crucial to halt deforestation, promote deforestation-free supply chains and make agri-food systems more efficient, inclusive, resilient and sustainable (FAO, 2020a).

Community-based forestry. Community-based forestry refers both to "collaborative regimes (forestry practiced on land that has some form of communal tenure and requires some level of collective action) and smallholder forestry" (FAO, 2017). Community-based forestry focuses on local communities as key stakeholders for sustainability, recognized customarily managed lands and the management of sacred sites or biodiversity by Indigenous Peoples.

Community-based social protection (CBSP). CBSP encompasses arrangements and actions taken by an individual or a group to minimize risks or to cope during difficult times, and which are not guided by formal legal regulations (Calder and Tanhchareun, 2014). CBSP is structured through social/family relations by the provision of benefits through community-based or family-based systems. These systems are growing in low-income countries where government social protection coverage is often low.

Conditional cash transfer. Conditional cash transfer programmes provide monetary transfers to households on the condition that they comply with certain pre-defined conditionalities, related, for example,e to the use of health services, the uptake of food and nutritional supplementation, and the enrollment and attendance of children and adolescents in school among others.

Contextual factors. Contextual factors refer to all those social, economic, political and biophysical factors that can influence the system and therefore lead to forest cover change or can affect the poverty situation (Oldekop *et al.*, 2021).

Deforestation. Deforestation refers to "the decrease in forest areas across the world that are lost for other uses such as agricultural croplands, urbanization, or mining activities" (FAO, 2020b).

Economic inclusion. The concept of economic inclusion refers to "the process composed of mechanisms that enhance the income generation capacity of the poor, or marginalized individuals within non-poor households, addressing social, environmental and productive constraints in a sustainable manner, to ensure a certain level and stability in income sources, out of poverty" (FAO, 2020c).

Ecosystem services. Ecosystem services refer to "the multitude of benefits that nature provides to society" (FAO, 2022). Ecosystem services can be categorized as: (i) provisioning – services that provide products such as wood, food, medicines, biochemicals and genetic resources; (ii) regulating – services that regulate environmental processes such as water flows and carbon storage. It includes the benefits obtained from climate regulation, natural hazard regulation, water purification and waste management, pollination and pest control; (iii) cultural – services that provide non-material benefits to people through spiritual enrichment, recreation and aesthetic experiences; and (iv) supporting – services such as soil formation and nutrient cycling necessary for the production of all other ecosystem services.

Forests and tree-based systems. Forests and tree-based systems include the spectrum from natural old-growth forests and those managed to optimize resource yields, to a broad range of agroforestry practices, and to single-species tree crop management.

Forest degradation. Forest degradation refers to "a reduction in the capacity of a forest to produce ecosystem services such as carbon storage and wood products as a result of anthropogenic and environmental changes" (FAO, 2011a).

Forest-dependent people. This term refers to people living in and around forests by capturing the spatial relationship between forests and humans without assuming anything else about the strength of this connection. The rationale behind focusing on spatial proximity instead of dependence, stems from the fact that all forest-dependent

people benefit directly from forests through multiple forest ecosystem services, while the same assumption cannot be made for people living further away from forests.

Forests producer organizations. Forest producer organizations are a form of collective action and are defined as formal or informal associations of forest producers. Examples of such organizations include tree-grower and agroforestry associations, associations of small- and medium-sized forest enterprises, associations of Indigenous Peoples, local community-based organizations, associations of community forest enterprises, informal village-level forest management groups, producer cooperatives and federations of producer organizations (Pasiecznik and Savenije, 2015; FAO and AgriCord, 2016).

Negative externalities. Negative externalities occur when the consumption or production of a good causes a harmful effect to a third party.

Payment for Ecosystem Services. Payment for ecosystem services is "an economic instrument designed to provide positive incentives to users of agricultural land and those involved in coastal or marine management (e.g. forest conservation and biodiversity and ecosystem protection)." This incentive is expected to result in continued or improved provision of ecosystem services, which, in turn, will benefit society as a whole (FAO, 2011b).

Poverty traps. Poverty traps are self-reinforcing mechanisms that cause poverty to persist over the long term.

Social protection. "The set of policies and programmes that addresses economic, environmental and social vulnerabilities to food insecurity and poverty by protecting and promoting livelihoods" (FAO, 2017).

Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and Agenda 2030 for Sustainable Development. The SDGs are a universal call to action to end poverty, protect the planet, and ensure that by 2030 all people enjoy peace and prosperity. The SDGs have been conceived as part of Resolution 70/1 of the United Nations General Assembly, known as Agenda 2030 for Sustainable Development. The 17 SDGs are broad and interconnected, as stated by Target 17.E: Enhance policy coherence for sustainable development. The SDGs cover sustainable development objectives such as ending poverty, hunger, AIDS, discrimination against women, global warming and enhancing the environment and social justice.

Tenure. Tenure concerns the "regimes that define who can use what resources, for how long and under what conditions". These systems can be based on written policies and laws, but also on unwritten customs and practices, especially when referring to collective property rights (Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure, FAO, 2012).

Participatory forest management. Participatory-forest management refers to the processes that enable those people who have a direct stake in forest resources to be part of decision-making in all aspects of forest management, from managing resources to formulating and implementing institutional frameworks. Participatory approaches, such as community-based forestry, are typically inscribed into national regulatory frameworks and may involve: drafting management plans, conducting forest inventories, and obtaining approval from government officials to harvest, transport and/or sell forest products.

Sustainable forest management. "The dynamic and evolving concept, which aims to maintain and enhance the economic, social and environmental values of all types of forests, for the benefit of present and future generations" (FAO, n.d online).

References

Angelsen, A., Jagger, P., Babigumira, R., Belcher, B., Hogarth, N.J., Bauch, S., Börner, J., Smith-Hall, C. & Wunder, S. 2014. Environmental income and rural livelihoods: A global-comparative analysis. *World Development*, 64(S1): S12–S28.

Atmadja, S. & Sills, E. 2015. Identifying the causes of tropical deforestation: Meta-analysis to test and develop economic theory. In M. Köhl & L. Pancel, eds. *Tropical forestry handbook*. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Verlag, pp. 1–27.

Bradley, A. & Fortuna, S. 2021. *Collective tenure rights for REDD+ implementation and sustainable development.* Rome, FAO. https://doi.org/10.4060/cb3521en

Byron, N. & Arnold, M. 1999. What futures for the people of the tropical forests? *World Development*, 27(5): 789–805.

Busch, J. & Ferretti-Gallon, K. 2017. What drives deforestation and what stops it? A metaanalysis. *Review of Environmental Economics and Policy*, 11(1): 3–23.

Calder, R. & Tanhchareun, T. 2014. Informal social protection: Social relations and cash transfers.

Cheng, S.H., Ahlroth, S., Onder, S., Shyamsundar, P., Garside, R., Kristjanson, P., McKinnon, M.C. & Miller, D.C. 2017. What is the evidence for the contribution of forests to poverty alleviation ? A systematic map protocol. *Environmental Evidence,* 6(1): 1–11.

Choumert, J., Motel, P.C. & Dakpo, H.K. 2013. Is the Environmental Kuznets Curve for deforestation a threatened theory? A meta-analysis of the literature. *Ecological Economics,* 90:19–28. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2013.02.016

FAO. 2011a. *Assessing forest degradation - Towards the development of globally applicable guidelines*. Rome. i2479e00.pdf

FAO. 2011b. *Payments for ecosystem services and food security.* Rome. https://www.fao.org/3/i2100e/i2100e.pdf

FAO. 2012. *Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests in the Context of National Food Security.* Rome. https://www.fao.org/3/i2801e/i2801e.pdf

FAO. 2016a. FAO *Strengthening coherence between agriculture and social protection to combat poverty and hunger in Africa: Framework for Analysis and Action*. Rome. http://www.fao.org/3/i5386e/i5386e.pdf

FAO. 2016b. FAO *Strengthening coherence between agriculture and social protection to combat poverty and hunger in Africa: Diagnostic Tool*. Rome. https://www.fao.org/publications/card/en/c/dc7cdda7-4bb7-4d0f-99c4-96f2352e385d

FAO. 2017. *FAO Social Protection Framework: Promoting rural development for all.* Rome. 67 pp. http://www.fao.org/3/i7016e/i7016e.pdf

FAO. 2020a. Committee on Forestry. Twenty-fifth Session. Transforming Agriculture and Food Systems: Halting Deforestation and Promoting Sustainable Production and Consumption of Forest Products. (August): 2–3.

FAO. 2020b. *Global Forest Resources Assessment 2020 – Key findings*. https://doi.org/10.4060/ca8753en

FAO. 2020c. *The contribution of social protection to economic inclusion in rural areas***.** Rome. http://www.fao.org/3/cb2458en/CB2458EN.pdf

FAO. 2021. *Strategic Framework 2022-31*. Rome. https://openknowledge.fao.org/server/api/core/bitstreams/29404c26-c71d-4982-a899-77bdb2937eef/content

FAO. 2022. *Framework for action on biodiversity for food and agriculture***.** Rome. https://openknowledge.fao.org/server/api/core/bitstreams/411b2edb-be9f-4ed3-a31b-354c7282843b/content

FAO. 2023. *Strengthening coherence between forestry and social protection for sustainable agrifood systems transformation – Framework for analysis and action***.** Rome. https://doi.org/10.4060/cc8648en

FAO. n.d. *Sustainable forest management.* Rome. [Cited 3 December 2021]. https://www.fao.org/forestry/sfm/en

FAO & AgriCord. 2016. *Forest and Farm Producer Organizations – Operating Systems for the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs): Strength in Numbers.* Rome, FAO.

FAO & Oxford Policy Management. 2013. *Qualitative research of the economic impacts of cash transfer programmes in sub-Saharan Africa: A research guide for the From Protection to Production project*. 49 pp. https://www.fao.org/3/aq662e/aq662e.pdf

FAO & UNEP. 2020. *The State of the World Forests. Forests, Biodiversity and People*. http://www.fao.org/3/ca8642en/CA8642EN.pdf

FAO, CIFOR, IFRI & World Bank. 2016. *National socioeconomic surveys in forestry*: *Guidance and survey modules for measuring the multiple roles of forests in household welfare and livelihoods*, by R.K. Bakkegaard, A. Agrawal, I. Animon, N. Hogarth, D. Miller, L. Persha, E. Rametsteiner, S. Wunder & A. Zezza. FAO Forestry Paper No. 179. https://www.fao.org/3/i6206e/i6206e.pdf

Ferraro, P.J. & Hanauer, M.M. 2014. Quantifying causal mechanisms to determine how protected areas affect poverty through changes in ecosystem services and infrastructure. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences:1–6.

Ferraro, P.J., Hanauer, M.M. & Sims, K. 2011. *Conditions associated with protected area success in conservation and poverty reduction*. PNAS 108, 13913–13918.

Fisher, R., Srimongkontip, S. & Veer, C. 1997. People and Forests in Asia and the Pacific: Situation and prospects. Asia-Pacific Forestry towards 2010. *Asia-Pacific Forestry Sector Outlook Study Working Paper Series.* Forestry Policy and Planning Division, Rome, and Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific, Bangkok.

Gavrilovic, M., Knowles, M., Pozarny, P. & Sabates-Wheeler, R. 2016. *Strengthening coherence between agriculture and social protection to combat poverty and hunger in Africa: Diagnostic Tool*. Rome, FAO. 58 pp. https://www.fao.org/3/i5385e/i5385e.pdf

Hajjar, R., Cheek, J.Z., Jagger, P., Kamoto, J., Newton, P., Oldekop, J., & Razafindratsima, O.H. 2021. Research frontiers on forests, trees, and poverty dynamics. *Forest Policy and Economics*, 131: 102554. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.forpol.2021.102554

ILO & FAO. 2021. *Effectively extending social protection to rural populations: Perspectives for a common FAO and ILO approach.* Geneva. https://doi.org/10.4060/cb2332en

Inter-Agency Social Protection Assessments. 2024. *Core Diagnostic Instrument*. Available here: https://socialprotection.org/sites/default/files/publications_files/CODI-English.pdf

Koop, G. & Tole, L. 1999. Is there an environmental Kuznets curve for deforestation? *Journal of Development Economics*, 58(1): 231–244.

Lawlor, K., Handa, S., Davis, B., & Seidenfeld, D. 2020. Poverty-environment relationships under market heterogeneity: Cash transfers and rural livelihoods in Zambia. *Environment and Development Economics*, 25(3):291–314. doi:10.1017/S1355770X19000305

Lwanga-Ntale, C. 2018. *A diagnostic on social protection needs and opportunities for forest-dependent communities in the United Republic of Tanzania*. Forestry Working Paper No. 6. Rome, FAO. https://www.fao.org/3/ca0376en/CA0376EN.pdf

Newton, P., Kinzer, A.T., Miller, D.C., Oldekop, J.A. & Agrawal, A. 2020. The number and spatial distribution of forest-dependent people globally. *One Earth,* 3(3): 363–70. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.oneear.2020.08.016

Oldekop, J.A., Gabay, M., Humphreys, D., Kamoto, J.F.M., Mutta, D.N., Song, C., Timko, J., Rasmussen, L.V. & Stoian, D. 2021. A framework for analysing contextual factors shaping forest-poverty dynamics. *Forest Policy and Economics*, 132: 102591. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.forpol.2021.102591

Pasiecznik, N. & Savenije, H. 2015. Effective forest and farm producer organizations. *ETFRN News* (57).

Ssanyu, R. 2017. *A mapping of social protection needs and opportunities for forest-dependent communities in Uganda*. Social Protection and Forestry Working Paper No. 2. Rome, FAO. 34 pp. https://www.fao.org/3/i8061e/i8061e.pdf

Sunderlin, W.D., Dewi, S., Puntodewo, A., Müller, D., Angelsen, A. & Epprecht, M. 2008. Why forests are important for global poverty alleviation: A spatial explanation. *Ecology and Society*, 13(2): 24. https://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/26267968.pdf

Tirivayi, N., Nennen, L., Tesfaye, W. & Ma, Q. 2018. The benefits of collective action: Exploring the role of forest producer organizations in social protection. *Forest Policy and Economics,* 90: 106–114.

Winder Rossi, N., Spano, F., Sabates-Wheeler, R., Kohnstamm, S. & Harvey, P. 2017. *Social protection and resilience: supporting livelihoods in protracted crises and in fragile and humanitarian contexts*. Rome, FAO. http://www.fao.org/3/a-i7606e.pdf

Xie, C. 2017. *Links between social protection and forestry policies – Lessons from China*. Social Protection and Forestry Working Paper No. 4. Rome, FAO. http://www.fao.org/3/i8046e/i8046e.pdf

For more information, please contact:
Forestry Division - Natural Resources and Sustainable Production
E-mail: NFO-Publications@fao.org
Web address: www.fao.org/forestry/en

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
Rome, Italy

ISBN 978-92-5-140304-4

9 789251 403044

CD7631EN/1/11.25